

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, claims 1-24¹ are pending in the application. Claims 1-24 were rejected. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. All of the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent Number 5,983,190 to Trower, II, et al. ("Trower"). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

In light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP §2131. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, (Fed. Cir. 1987) (cited in MPEP §2131). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (cited in MPEP §2131).

¹ The Office Action Summary included with the November 20, 2006 Office action erroneously states that only claims 1-20 are pending and that only claims 1-20 are rejected. The body of the Office action, however, correctly states that claims 1-24 are pending and that claims 1-24 are rejected.

Trower does not teach or disclose the invention claimed in the application. At page 3 of the Office action, it is asserted that “Trower teaches a method for accessing a Baan server (fig. 2A, item 16, 23).” Trower does not contain a fig. 2A. It appears that this reference is left over from the previous Office action which stated that Mullen taught a Baan server. Furthermore, a careful review of Trower confirms that no where in Trower is a Baan server disclosed. Furthermore, Trower does not disclose the methods for accessing a Baan server claimed in claims 1 and 17, or the system for accessing a Baan server disclosed in claim 11.

What Trower Discloses

Trower discloses an invention that relates to user interface design in computers and more specifically relates to animated user interfaces. Trower, col. 1, lines 8-9. More concretely, Trower discloses a user interface design for use via the internet that approximates the ubiquitous helpful paperclip “Office Assistant” that, for example, is part of the Microsoft Office suite. See Trower, col. 1, lines 49-57; id. at col. 2, lines 15-20. In particular, Trower discloses an animation system comprising an animation server, speech synthesis engine, and a speech recognition engine. Trower, col. 2, lines 43-45.

The animation server (shown in FIG. 3 of Trower) is implemented as an OLE server. Trower, col. 21, lines 55-61. FIG. 10 of the Trower patent illustrates the hierarchy of the objects supported in the animation server. Trower, col. 21, lines 55-61. The top level object of the animation server is the agent object 360, which represents an interactive, animated user interface character called an agent. Trower, col. 21, lines 57-60. An example of this type of character is the genie shown in FIG. 2 of Trower. Trower, col. 21, lines 60-61.

The animation server exposes its animation and speech input/output services to clients through a programming interface. Trower, col. 2, lines 50-52. Clients specify the speech or cursor input from the user that a character will respond to through a command method in the server's interface. Trower, col. 2, lines 63-65. When the animation server detects input from the user of the type that a client has requested, the animation server sends a notification to that client. Trower, col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 2.

Clients of the animation server access the animation server's animation services using the methods, properties, and events of an agent object's interface. Trower, col. 23, lines 7-9. Clients of the animation server specify a text string, which the speech output engine converts into digitized audio. Trower, col. 23, lines 34-35. The speech synthesis engine converts text to digital audio output in response to requests from the animation server. Trower, col. 2, lines 45-47. The speech recognition engine analyzes digitized audio input to identify words or phrases selected by the animation server. Trower, col. 2, lines 47-49.

Claims 1, 11, and 17: What Trower Does Not Disclose

Trower Does Not Disclose an "Application Function Server of the Baan Server," A Baan Server, Wherein the Visual Basic Program Is Used to Access the Baan Server," or "A Network Server Means for Accessing a Baan Server through a Visual Basic Program"

Trower does not teach or disclose an "application function server of the Baan server" as in claim 1, "a Baan server, wherein the Visual Basic program is used to access the Baan server" as in claim 11, or "a network server means for accessing a Baan server through a Visual Basic program" as in claim 17 because, as discussed above, Trower does not disclose a Baan server. The animation server, discussed above, is "implemented as an OLE server." Trower, col. 21,

lines 55-56. Thus, while Trower discloses an OLE server, it does not disclose the OLE server of a Baan server.

Trower Does Not Disclose “Sending Data From A Visual Basic Program To an Application Function Server of the Baan Server,” or “Means for Sending Data From A Visual Basic Program To an Application Function Server of the Baan Server”

Trower does not teach or disclose “sending data from a Visual Basic program to an application function server of the Baan server” as in claim 1, or a “means for sending data from a Visual Basic program to an application function server of the Baan server” as in claims 11 and 17. As discussed above, the OLE server is not disclosed as an OLE server of a Baan server. Because the application function server of the Baan server is not present in Trower, Trower cannot teach or disclose “sending data from a Visual Basic program to an application function server of the Baan server,” or a “means for sending data from a Visual Basic program to an application function server of the Baan server.”

Trower Does Not Disclose “Receiving Data at the Baan Server,” or “Means for Receiving Data at the Baan Server”

As discussed above, Trower does not teach or disclose a Baan server. Thus, Trower cannot teach or disclose “receiving data at the Baan server” as in claim 1 or “means for receiving data at the Baan server” as in claims 11 and 17.

Trower Does Not Disclose “Utilizing the Application Function Server to Communicate the Data To At Least One Software Object With the At Least One Baan Session Object,” or “Means for Utilizing the Application Function Server to Communicate the Data To At Least One Software Object With the At Least One Baan Session Object”

As discussed above, Trower does not teach or disclose a Baan server. Thus, Trower cannot teach or disclose a Baan session object. The portion of the Trower specification cited in the Office action (Trower, col. 23, lines 1-60) refers the “agent object.” As discussed above, the agent object (shown as element 360 in Trower FIG. 10) is the top level object of the animation server, and it represents an interactive, animated user interface character called an agent (shown as element 60 in Trower FIG. 2). Trower, col. 21, lines 57-60. The cited Trower specification merely states that “[c]lients of the animation server access its animation services using the methods, properties, and events of the agent object’s interface.” Because Trower does not disclose a Baan server, this “agent object” cannot be a “Baan session object” as claimed in claims 1, 11, and 17 of the application.

Trower Does Not Disclose “Utilizing the Visual Basic Program to Communicate With the at Least One Baan Session Object Via the Application Function Server,” or “Means for Utilizing the Visual Basic Program to Communicate With the at Least One Baan Session Object Via the Application Function Server”

As discussed above, Trower does not teach or disclose a Baan server. Because Trower does not disclose a Baan server, the “agent object” disclosed in Trower and discussed above, cannot be a “Baan session object” as claimed in the application. Thus, because Trower does not disclose a Baan session object, Trower cannot disclose “utilizing the Visual Basic program to communicate with the at least one Baan session object via the application function server” as in claim 1, or “means for utilizing the Visual Basic program to communicate with the at least one Baan session object via the application function server” as in claims 11 or 17.

Trower Does Not Disclose “Storing Information in the Baan Server in Response to the Received Data,” or “Means for Storing Information in the Baan Server in Response to the Received Data”

As discussed above, Trower does not teach or disclose a Baan server, and at least for this reason, Trower cannot teach or disclose “storing information in the Baan server in response to the received data” as in claim 1, or “means for storing information in the Baan server in response to the received data” as in claims 11 or 17.

Furthermore, nowhere does Trower teach or disclose storing any information communicated by a client of the animation server in response to the received data. Instead, Trower merely discloses “[c]lients specify[ing] a text string, which the speech output engine converts into digitized audio output.” Trower, col. 23, lines 34-35. Trower further discloses that the animation server “passes the appropriate text to the speech synthesis engine,” which is loaded on an end user’s machine. Trower, col. 23, lines 37-42. Thus, Trower discloses at best a system where a text string specified to the animation server by a client is passed by the client to a speech synthesis engine which is loaded on an end user’s machine. This is not “storing information in the Baan server in response to the received data,” as is claimed in the application. Thus, for at least these reasons, Tower does not disclose “storing information in the Baan server in response to the received data” as in claim 1, or “means for storing information in the Baan server in response to the received data” as in claims 11 or 17.

Thus, independent claims 1, 11, and 17 are believed to be directed to patentable subject matter. Dependent claims 3, 4, and 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, dependent claims 12, and 14-15 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11 and claim 18 depends directly or indirectly from claim 17, respectively, define patentable subject matter at least by virtue of their dependency as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 5-10, 13, 16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Trower in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,111 to Rogers, et al. (“Rogers”). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

In view of the discussion above regarding Trower, independent claims 1, 11, and 17 are believed to be directed to patentable subject matter. Dependent claims 2 and 5-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, dependent claims 13 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11, and claims 19 and 20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 17, respectively, define patentable subject matter at least by virtue of their dependency as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request all the objections and rejections to the specification and claims be removed. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 202-861-1610 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding before issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Docket No.87354.3161
Serial No. 09/904,503
Customer No. 30734

PATENT

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No.87354.3161.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Phong D. Nguyen
Registration No. 43,833

Date: February 20, 2007
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783